

Date: Tue, 27 Sep 94 04:30:14 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #1067
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 27 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 1067

Today's Topics:

 147.555 Repeater
 Answer to "How far can I talk?"
 PC-based digital communications software

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 26 Sep 1994 20:37:15 GMT
From: pagesat.net!news.cerf.net!hacgate2.hac.com!usenet@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: 147.555 Repeater
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article 9pv@venus.nist.gov, proctor@onyx.nist.gov (James E. Proctor) writes:
>There was an article in the Dec 15, 1993 WESTLINK REPORT (front cover) that
>tells of a ham who put a repeater on 147.49 MHz, caused interference to a
>simplex net, and received a notice from the FCC that the operation of a
>non-coordinated repeater may not cause interference to other amateur operators.
>The notice said that Section 97.205 states that an uncoordinated repeater does
>not have the same right to use of the band as simplex operators or coordinated
>repeaters. The notice also warned that failure to comply could result in loss
>of license.

Where in section 97.205 (or anywhere else) does it say anything about the status
of
uncoordinated repeaters vs. simplex operators? I thought the only reference to
uncoordinated repeaters was with respect to coordinated ones. The uncoordinated
repeater must not cause interference to the simplex operators only in as much as

any station must not cause interference with another. Note that this means the simplex operators also must not cause interference to the uncoordinated repeater! I would guess that there are some details left out of the scenario mentioned above.

-Brian
suggs@tcville.es.hac.com

Date: 26 Sep 1994 20:21:41 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Answer to "How far can I talk?"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Cwq6yt.C41@indep1.chi.il.us>, clifto@indep1.chi.il.us (Clifton T. Sharp) writes:

|>In article <mwhite-230994133046@m14494-mac.mitre.org> mwhite@mitre.org (Michael White) writes:

|>>but here's a useful little rule of thumb: The distance to the "radio
|>>horizon" is the square root of twice the antenna height in feet. This
|>>represents the maximum line of sight distance over flat ground; terrain,
|>

|> Lessee; my duckie is 5 feet above ground, so the "radio horizon" is
|>3.16 feet away? I was sure I was getting at least 30 feet to that other
|>radio! :-)

|>
|> Yes, I know, "the distance to the 'radio horizon' IN MILES is the
|>square root of twice the antenna height in feet". You big silly.

Actually it's closer to 50% greater than that for the radio horizon. The formula is something like: $d=1.4\sqrt{h}$ where d is in miles and h is height in feet. Also note that the distance you can communicate is the sum of the distance of each stations horizon. So for two people with their radios 5 feet off the ground, ought to be able to communicate to a distance of about 9 miles plus or minus terrain variations and obstacles.

Also note that this distance is for line-of-sight communication, which is appropriate for your 2 meter HT, but not for a 2 meter weak signal station that is using 10-15 dB gain antennas and 100-200 watts of power. A station like that with an antenna at 50' should be able to communicate with a similarly equipment station to a distance of 150 miles or so reliably. This is as opposed to the 28 miles predicted above.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 26 Sep 94 09:33:33 PDT
From: news.sprintlink.net!nwnexus!seanews!peterk@uunet.uu.net
Subject: PC-based digital communications software
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone have experience with both BMK-MULTY and HAMCOMM (the one by W.F. Schroeder, DL5YEC)?

I already have an HF modem with good filters (an AEA CP-1). So rather than getting an expensive TNC, I'm interested in a PC-based digital communications package for HF that includes CW, RTTY, AMTOR, and PACTOR.

Could anyone post or email me a features and price comparison?

Thanks and 73,
--Peter Klein, KD7MW

peterk@seanews.akita.com

Note: I'm interested in programs that actually do the decoding in the PC, NOT terminal programs for a TNC.

--
[] SEANEWS [] Seattle Public Access Usenet News + Mail []
peterk@seanews.akita.com [] +1 206 614 0048 (v.FC 28.8k) []

Date: 26 Sep 1994 18:43:56 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
kgkmac.repoc.nwu.edu!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <35v377\$i6r@everest.pinn.net>, <35v21v\$k9c@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
<35vj0f\$nv9@news.aero.org>
Subject : Re: Restrictive Covenants: I can't have *any* antenna?

I came across this in "rec.video.satellite" today and thought I'd pass it on here. It is presented in Edited form, eliminating the names of the original posters, since I didn't ask them for permission to cross post this. Perhaps this information will be useful here for ham antennas. I do not any experience with this group or other information than what is presented here. I would suggest checking the FAQ for rec.video.satellite for additional information.

- Ken

Date: 04-11-94 21:06 (Public)

Subject: Kudos to FAC for ASTA

I want to express my thanks to the FAC keeper for pointing me to ASTA.

I am contemplating acquiring a satellite receiver and my deed restrictions prohibit such animals. A quick look at the FAC and I was turned on to ASTA. One call to them got me a warm fuzzy feeling that I could indeed battle my civic association on this. ASTA has two packages One for Zoning and another for Restricted Covenances. I just received the later which cost \$34.95 and found it very enlightening. The "Restricted Neighborhoods and Unrestricted Skies" document by Lauritz Helland was most informative and written in a non-inflammatory way. I plan to use this to back up my position that I can install the dish, regardless of the No outside antenna position of our deed restrictions.

I found that the ASTA people genuinely helpful and do not begrudge the cost of the legal packet one bit. They were extremely please to hear that I found out about them from the internet, they knew about it but unfortunately are not on it. Since ASTA is a non-profit organization, they are funded entirely on sales of these two legal packets. I encourage anyone who is considering installing a satellite receiver to support ASTA. Without them, I would have felt very alone and intimidated by my community's restrictions that were made 15 years ago and obviously out of date.

I don't have any affiliation with ASTA, I just felt that they offer a very valuable service and are unfortunately not well known. (My satellite dealer who has been in business 12 years didn't know about them).

Anticipating a world of new viewing

>>> Ahhh, this is what I need, a source of information. Just what is the
>>> 'ASTA'? I'd sure like to find an organization which knows something about
>>> fighting for the right to place a dish on your own property.

AMERICAN SATELLITE TELEVISION ALLIANCE (ASTA), headquartered in Valhalla, NY, is a non-Profit organization formed to combat zoning and covenant restrictions that impede the rights of dish owners to purchase and use satellite TV systems. For more information as ASTA, call (914) 997-8192.

Kenneth Kalan PP ASEL
Northwestern University
Prosthetics Research Laboratory
Rehabilitation Engineering Program
kgk@nwu.edu N9YIR

 ===_ / |
| ___/[___] ___/___ |
|___-|___|_____/_____
| \/
o 0

: and the energy is usually released via kinetic excitation of the atoms or
: molecules involved.

: >fine with a 100 watts from a 2 meter transmitter. Check the 1972
: ^^^^

True, there are absorption peaks. But, since they aren't used by
microwave ovens, I stand by my assertion that the theory doesn't
apply. Or, does anyone know of a 24 GHz microwave oven that one can
buy that does an acceptable job of cooking food?

: >where people won't complain about interference. Secondly, it has to cook
: ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
: >food all the way through (no raw meat in the middle). Finally, it has
: ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
: That's why the H2O absorption theory works well - almost everything we
: cook contains lots of water.

No it doesn't, the lowest absorbtion frequency peak is too high to
effectively penetrate thick pieces of food.

Why are absorption peaks needed? True, you don't have to work as hard
to transfer energy to the food. But, look at other mechanisms used for
cooking food, such as stoves and fireplaces. They seem to do an acceptable
job--I'd rather eat a hamburger cooked by a theoretically inefficient
fireplace than eat a raw one!

--

Zack Lau KH6CP/1 2 way QRP WAS
8 States on 10 GHz
Internet: zlau@arrl.org 10 grids on 2304 MHz

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #1067
